



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,836	10/08/2004	Shang-Pin Sun	MTKP0185USA	5835
27765	7590	09/17/2008	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			PENDLETON, DIONNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/17/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com
Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com
mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/711,836	Applicant(s) SUN ET AL.	
	Examiner DIONNE H. PENDLETON	Art Unit 2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-14, 16-18, 20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-14, 16-18, 20 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. **Claims 1 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **MIYAOKA (US 5,398,227)**.

Regarding claims 1 and 10,

In Miyaoka's discussion of the prior art, Miyaoka teaches an optical device having a light emitting device and a method of calibration having a light emitting device (**"32" in figure 4**) and a photo monitor (**"32b" in figure 4**), comprising:

controlling power of the light emitting device by changing values of a drive signal to the light emitting device (**column 2, lines 13-15 and lines 22-25 disclose that the laser is controlled via a first and second drive current**),

detecting light, via **"32b"** emitted by the light emitting device (**32a**) and generating a monitor signal having a value corresponding to the light emitted by the light emitting device utilizing the photo monitor (**output of laser (32a) is monitored and a voltage signal, corresponding to laser power, is generated; said voltage signal corresponding, at least in part, to "a monitor signal"**);

converting received monitor signal values for a plurality of drive signals to corresponding powers of the light emitting device according to a predetermined conversion rule (*column 2, lines 19-22*); and

determining a preliminary power relationship relating values of the drive signal to powers of the light emitting device according to received monitor signal values for a plurality of drive signal values and a predetermined conversion rule (*column 2, lines 27-33*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 14 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **MIYAOKA (US 5,398,227)** in view of **CALL (US 5,640,381)**.

Regarding claims 2 and 11,

Miyaoka teaches the method and device of claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Miyaoka fails to teach determining an offset value and converting the received monitor signal values according to the offset value as claimed.

Call teaches determining an offset value being a maximum value of the drive signal where the light emitting device does not emit light according to the received monitor signal values (**column 11:35-46; also step “218” in Figure 9**);

and converting the received monitor signal values corresponding to drive signal values being higher than the offset value to power values according to the predetermined conversion rule to thereby generate the preliminary power relationship (**steps “224”-“226” in Figure 9 wherein a plurality of laser generated emissions are analyzed (226) for the purpose of identifying the optimal power level**).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Miyaoka and Call, further calculating the threshold current for each sector in which OPC is performed, for the purpose of more accurately calibrating laser intensities to a desired laser power.

Regarding claims 3 and 12,

Call teaches the method and device of claims 2 and 11, respectively, wherein determining the preliminary power relationship relating the values of the drive signal to the powers of the light emitting device further comprises the following steps:

controlling the power of the light emitting device by utilizing a first drive signal value and a second drive signal value (**column 11, lines 35-37**);

extrapolating monitor signal values of a line formed between a first received value of the monitor signal corresponding to the first drive signal value, and a second

Art Unit: 2627

received value of the monitor signal corresponding to the second drive signal value
(step “218” in figure 9);

determining the offset value of the drive signal to be a crossing value of the drive signal corresponding to where the extrapolated monitor signal values of the line cross a predetermined value of the monitor signal when the light emitting device is not emitting any light **(also in step “218” in figure ; and see column 11, lines 37-46);**

and converting the extrapolated monitor signal values of the line corresponding to drive signal values being higher than the offset value to power values according to the predetermined conversion rule to thereby generate the preliminary power relationship **(steps “219” through “227” in figure 9).**

Regarding claim 14,

Call teaches the auto-calibrating optical device of claim 11, wherein the power relationship correction operation involves the microprocessor performing an optimum power control (OPC) on the optical medium of the optical device.

3. **Claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 17, 18, 20 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **MIYAOKA (US 5,398,227)** in view of **KUROKAWA (US Publication 2005/0088953).**

Regarding claims 4 and 13,

Miyaoka teaches the method and device of claims 1 and 10.

Miyaoka fails to expressly teach further generating a final power relationship by performing a power relationship correction operation comprising the steps as claimed.

Kurokawa teaches further generating a final power relationship by performing a power relationship correction operation on an optical medium of the optical device; the power relationship correction operation comprising the following steps: writing test data to the optical medium of the optical device using a particular drive signal value for a predetermined power value according to the preliminary power relationship **([0069] discloses writing test data of varied power, each resulting from a “particular drive signal”);** reading a read signal corresponding to the test data from the optical medium **(paragraphs [0071-0074]);** and analyzing the read signal to determine if the test data was written to the optical medium at the particular power and correspondingly adjusting the preliminary power relationship such that the test data is written to the optical medium at the predetermined power to thereby generate the final power relationship **(see equation [0069] used for analyzing the read signals for the purpose of adjusting the power relationship i.e., adjusting the drive signal for achieving the desired power intensity).**

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Miyaoka and Kurokawa, further generating a final power relationship by performing a power relationship correction operation comprising the steps as claimed, for the purpose of more accurately calibrating laser intensities to a desired laser power.

Regarding claim 5,

Kurokawa teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the power relationship correction operation involves performing an optimum power control (OPC) on the optical medium of the optical device.

Regarding claims 8 and 17,

Miyaoka teaches the method and device of claims 1 and 10, respectively, wherein the optical device is an optical disc drive or a optical disc recorder, the photo monitor is a front monitor diode (FMD), and the light emitting device is a laser diode ***(Figure 1 illustrates that the photo detector “32b” is mounted in a housing together with the laser diode “32a”).***

Regarding claims 9 and 18,

Miyaoka teaches the method and device of claims 8 and 17, respectively, being capable of calibrating the write power or the read power of the laser diode.

Regarding claims 20 and 21,

The combined disclosures of Miyaoka and Kurokawa teach the method and device of claims 4 and 13, respectively.

The combined disclosures of Miyaoka and Kurokawa fail to explicitly teach that the power correction operation is performed during manufacture. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that the provision of recommended data related to write

pulse shape, laser recording power value, laser reproducing power value etc., is well known in the art and would have been obvious for the purpose of providing a starting point for firmware of the drive apparatus.

4. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **MIYAOKA (US 5,398,227)** in view of **KUROKAWA (US Publication 2005/0088953)** as applied to claim 4, and further in view of **KENJO (US 5,029,155)**.

Regarding claim 7,

The combined disclosures of Miyaoka and Kurokawa teach the method of auto-calibration recited in claim 4.

The combined disclosures of Miyaoka and Kurokawa fail to expressly teach storing the final power relationship for use during normal operations.

Kenjo teaches a non-volatile memory (**“28” in figure 1**) for storing the final power relationship determined by the microprocessor during the calibration mode, the final power relationship being used by the microprocessor during normal operations for controlling values of the drive signal according to desired powers of the light emitting device (**column 5, lines 32-39; also see column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 3**).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Miyaoka, Kurokawa and Kenjo, storing the final power relationship determined by the microprocessor during the calibration mode, the

final power relationship being used during normal operations, for the purpose of recording and reproducing data using a power level most suitable to the disc.

5. **Claim 16** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **MIYAOKA (US 5,398,227)** in view of **CALL (US 5,640,381)** as applied to claim 11, and further in view of **KENJO (US 5,029,155)**.

Regarding claim 16,

The combined disclosures of Miyaoka and Call teach the method of auto-calibration recited in claim 11.

The combined disclosures of Miyaoka and Call fail to expressly teach storing the final power relationship for use during normal operations.

Kenjo teaches a non-volatile memory (**“28” in figure 1**) for storing the final power relationship determined by the microprocessor during the calibration mode, the final power relationship being used by the microprocessor during normal operations for controlling values of the drive signal according to desired powers of the light emitting device (**column 5, lines 32-39; also see column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 3**).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Miyaoka, Call and Kenjo, storing the final power relationship determined by the microprocessor during the calibration mode, the final

power relationship being used during normal operations, for the purpose of recording and reproducing data using a power level most suitable to the disc.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims rejected in Official Action mailed 5/5/2008, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ueda (US 2007/0133368) discloses parameter data recommended by the manufacturer.

Minemura (US 2007/0121463) discloses parameter data recommended by the manufacturer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DIONNE H. PENDLETON whose telephone number is (571)272-7497. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:30-7:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on 571-272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dionne H Pendleton/
Examiner, Art Unit 2627

/Wayne Young/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627